

Sub  
E2  
131. The method of claim 121, wherein said non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis comprises the presence of a polyp.

132. The method of claim 121, wherein said non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis comprises the presence of allergic mucus.

133. The method of claim 121, wherein said non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis comprises eosinophilia.

134. The method of claim 121, wherein said non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis comprises allergic fungal sinusitis. /C

B1  
cont  
135. The method of claim 122, wherein said non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis comprises the presence of a polyp.

Sub  
E3  
136. The method of claim 122, wherein said non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis comprises the presence of allergic mucus.

137. The method of claim 122, wherein said non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis comprises eosinophilia.

138. The method of claim 122, wherein said non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis comprises allergic fungal sinusitis. /C

Sub  
E4  
139. The method of claim 124, wherein said non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis comprises the presence of a polyp.

140. The method of claim 124, wherein said non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis comprises the presence of allergic mucus.

*3/15/00  
cont.  
B  
conced.* 141. The method of claim 124, wherein said non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis comprises eosinophilia.

142. The method of claim 124, wherein said ~~non~~-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis comprises allergic fungal sinusitis. */C*

### REMARKS

Claims 70-126 have been rejected. Claims 127-142 have been added herein. Thus, claims 70-142 are pending. The specification as filed provides support for claims 127-142. For example, page 59, lines 3-19 disclose the results of treating patients having non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis with polyps in the middle meatus (stage 2) or with polyps filling the nasal cavity (stage 3); page 58, lines 19-24 disclose that the patients had non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis with allergic mucus; page 66, lines 1-14 disclose the results of treating a patient having non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis with eosinophilia; and page 4, lines 8-10 disclose that non-invasive fungus-induced rhinosinusitis can be allergic fungal sinusitis (AFS). Thus, no new matter is added by these amendments. In light of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 70-142.

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 70-126 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the phrases "in an amount"; "at a frequency"; "for a duration"; and "at least a portion of" are vague and indefinite because they are relative. The Examiner also stated that as a result "it is impossible for one of ordinary skill in the art to gauge the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The terms "in an amount"; "at a frequency"; and "for a duration" are described in Applicant's specification and have a clear and unambiguous meaning. For example, the section at page 40, lines 1-12 of Applicant's specification describes the meaning of an effective amount. In addition, the section at page 42, lines 4-8 describes effective frequencies, and the section at page 42, lines 16-25 describes effective durations. Moreover, the